

On Internal Consistency of Holographic Dark Energy Models

R. Horvat*

Rudjer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia

Abstract

Holographic dark energy (HDE) models, underlain by an effective quantum field theory (QFT) with a manifest UV/IR connection, have become a convincing candidate for the dark energy in the universe. On the other hand, the maximum number of quantum states a conventional QFT in the box of size L is capable to describe, refer to those boxes which are on the brink of experiencing a sudden collapse to a black hole. Another restriction on the underlying QFT is that the UV cutoff, which cannot be chosen independently of the IR cutoff and therefore becomes a function of time in a cosmological setting, should stay the largest energy scale even in the standard cosmological epochs preceding a dark energy dominated one. We show that, irrespective of whether one deals with the saturated form of HDE or takes a certain degree of non-saturation in the past, the above restrictions cannot be met in a radiation-dominated universe, an epoch in the history of the universe which is expected to be perfectly describable within conventional QFT.

*Electronic address: horvat@lei3.irb.hr

The holographic principle [1, 2] is undoubtedly the most amazing ingredient of a modern view of space and time. The most successful realization of the holographic principle, implemented in the Maldacena's discovery of AdS/CFT duality [3], strengthened further this speculative idea about quantum gravity. On the other hand, other closely related concepts forming crucial parts within a new paradigm, like black hole complementarity [4], the UV/IR connection [5], the space-time uncertainty relation [6] and the occurrence of the minimal length scale [7], do become completely manifest in the framework of the holographic principle.

In order to encode (via the holographic information) a drastic depletion of quantum states within the effective field-theoretical description, preventing at the same time formation of black holes, the entropy for an effective quantum field theory $\sim L^3 \Lambda^3$, where L is the size of the region (providing an IR cutoff) and Λ is the UV cutoff, should obey the upper bound [8]

$$L^3 \Lambda^3 \leq (S_{BH})^{3/4} \sim L^{3/2} M_{Pl}^{3/2}, \quad (1)$$

and $S_{BH} \sim L^2 M_{Pl}^2$ is the holographic Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. In an expanding universe Λ should therefore be promoted to a varying quantity (some decreasing function of L), in order (1) not to be violated during the course of the expansion, manifesting thereby explicitly the UV/IR correspondence. This gives a constraint on the maximum energy density in the effective theory, $\rho_\Lambda \leq L^{-2} M_{Pl}^2$. Obviously, ρ_Λ is the energy density corresponding to a zero-point energy and the cutoff Λ ¹.

The origin of (1) stems from the fact that in an effective QFT the entropy scales extensively, $S \sim L^3 \Lambda^3$, and therefore (for any Λ) there is a sufficiently large volume for which S would exceed the absolute bound S_{BH} . Thus, considerations for the maximum possible

¹ Indeed, this may be seen by calculating the effective cosmological constant (CC) generated by vacuum fluctuations (zero point energies)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\Lambda &\propto \int_{L^{-1}}^{\Lambda} k^2 dk \sqrt{k^2 + m^2} \sim \Lambda^4 & \Lambda &\gtrsim m \\ &\sim m \Lambda^3 & \Lambda &\lesssim m, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

since clearly ρ_Λ (as withal the entropy) is dominated by UV modes. Although the constraint $\rho_\Lambda \leq L^{-2} M_{Pl}^2$ stays the same for both limiting cases, the UV/IR correspondence is however different, giving $L \sim \Lambda^{-2}$ and $L \sim \Lambda^{-3/2}$, respectively, when the bound is saturated. Such a distinction becomes important in a subsequent discussion.

entropy suggest that ordinary QFT may not be valid for arbitrarily large volumes, unless the UR and IR cutoffs satisfy a bound, $L\Lambda^3 \lesssim M_{Pl}^2$. However, when saturated, this bound means that an effective QFT should also be capable to describe systems containing black holes, since it necessarily includes many states with Schwarzschild radius much larger than the box size. The arguments of why an effective QFT appears unlikely to provide an adequate description of any system containing a black hole can be found in [8] and in references therein. So, ordinary QFT may not be valid for much smaller volumes, but would apply provided (1) is satisfied.

The above effective field-theoretical setup has triggered a novel variable CC approach [9] generically dubbed ‘holographic dark energy’ (HDE) [10]. The main reason of why the above HDE model is so appealing in possible description of dark energy is when the holographic bound (1) is saturated, ρ_Λ gives the right amount of dark energy in the universe at present, provided L today is of order of the Hubble parameter. Moreover, since ρ_Λ is now a running quantity, it also has a potential to shed some light on the ‘cosmic coincidence problem’ [11]. In addition, the original model [8] is capable to satisfy current observations [12], since by construction it has $\omega_\Lambda = -1$.

The most pressing problem when dealing with cosmologies based on (1) is certainly the choice for the infrared cutoff L^{-1} . For models based on full saturation in (1), the choice in the form of the inverse Hubble parameter is largely unsatisfactory (for spatially flat universes as suggested by observations) both for perfect fluids [9] as well as interacting fluids [13, 14]; in the former case one cannot explain the accelerating expansion of the present universe, while one fails to explain that the acceleration sets in just recently and was preceded by a deceleration era at $z \gtrsim 1$, in the latter case. This is easy to see by plugging $\rho_\Lambda = L^{-2}M_{Pl}^2$ (setting a prefactor to unity for simplicity) into the Friedman equation for flat space

$$(HL)^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}(1+r) , \quad (3)$$

where $r = \rho_m/\rho_\Lambda$ and ρ_m is the matter energy density. Thus, a choice $L \sim H^{-1}$ would require the ratio r to be a constant. This is a general statement, holding irrespective a fluid is perfect or not, even irrespective the Newton constant is varying or not. The interpretation for various cases is, however, different. For perfect fluids, $r = const.$ means that the equation of state for the dark energy unavoidably matches that of pressureless matter, $w = 0$ [9]. Thus, we cannot explain the accelerating expansion of the present universe. For interacting

fluids, one is usually able to generate accelerated expansion with $r = \text{const.}$ as now $a \sim t^{2/3}$ switches to $a \sim t^{2/3m}$, where the parameter m depends on the interaction term and can be easily made $m < 2/3$ [13, 14] so as to ensure acceleration. The constancy of r for the flat space case precludes however any transition between the cosmological epochs. Generically, a suggestion of setting L according to the future event horizon [15] leads to phenomenologically viable models. Even the choice $L = H^{-1}$ can be saved in models where a certain degree of non-saturation in (1) is allowed in the past [14, 16].

In the present paper, we aim to check whether the effective field-theoretical setup underlying (1), is capable of describing various cosmological epochs consistently. That is, if (1), besides the late-time acceleration in a dark-energy dominated epoch, provides also a consistent description of some earlier epoch, say the radiation-dominated universe. The consistency check will be based on the following two requirements: (i) a radiation-dominated epoch is considered as a system at a temperature T , having thermal energy $L^3 T^4$, provided $L^{-1} < T < \Lambda(L)$, where the UV cutoff $\Lambda(L)$ is now a running quantity which is to comply with (1), and (ii) the range of validity of the effective QFT is restricted only to those systems not containing black holes. In the following we argue that as soon as we move from the epoch at which the dark energy overwhelmingly dominates all other forms of energy densities, any consistent description based on (1) is no longer viable². This conclusion remains irrespective of the choice for L and a degree of saturation in (1).

Let us begin with models saturating (1). As mentioned earlier, apart from a small set of models presented in [14, 16], the bulk of the models have employed (1) in its saturated form. The HDE density in the latter case is conveniently parametrized as $\rho_\Lambda = (3c^2/8\pi)L^{-2}M_{Pl}^2$ [10], with a parameter c^2 of order of unity. The corresponding Schwarzschild radius for a box of volume L^3 dominated by ρ_Λ ,

$$R_s \sim M_{Pl}^{-2}(L^3 \rho_\Lambda) \sim L, \quad (4)$$

² It was already noted in the background paper [8] that within an effective QFT, requiring cutoffs which do obey (1), there is no admissibility of simultaneously addressing the CC problem and complying with computations relevant for current laboratory experiments. To address the CC problem with a naive estimate, $\rho_\Lambda \sim \Lambda^4$, one requires a UV cutoff of order of $10^{-2.5}$ eV. Such a cutoff would induce a discrepancy in the calculation of $(g-2)$ for the electron, between a framework relying on (1) and a conventional one performed in an infinite box, which is unacceptably large, c.f. Eq.(5) in [8]. Here we focus on consistent description within cosmology only.

always sets the system at the brink of collapse to a black hole. It is important to note that this contribution of ρ_Λ in R_s is *always* such throughout the history of the universe, notwithstanding of which form of energy dominates a particular epoch. This means that every epoch preceding a dark energy dominated phase, where ρ_Λ necessarily represents a subdominant component in the total energy density of the universe, would set R_s at $R_s \gg L$. That is, in epochs when ρ_Λ is subdominant, R_s would rise up, $R_s \gg L$, since R_s is determined by the *total* energy density. That way, if the same effective QFT is to describe other cosmological epochs besides the current one, it necessarily includes many states with R_s much larger than the box size. In order not to contradict standard cosmology, one should assume that in a radiation-dominated universe $\rho_{rad} \sim T^4$, and thus with $\rho_{rad} \gg \rho_\Lambda$ one necessarily includes many states with $R_s \gg L$, which are not expected to be describable within conventional QFT. One can be hoped to remedy the situation by applying the same recipe leading to (1), which brings HDE to a domain describable within QFT. This amounts that the total energy of the system of size L should not exceed the mass of the the same-sized black hole, i.e., $L^3 T^4 \lesssim L M_{Pl}^2$. Apparently, radiation states would be safe as now $R_s \lesssim L$. The same constraint would however preclude radiation from being the dominant component, as $\rho_{rad} \sim T^4 \lesssim L^{-2} M_{Pl}^2 \sim \rho_\Lambda$. So, we see that any saturated HDE model precludes either description of radiation within ordinary QFT or a transition between the cosmological epochs ³.

Arguably much better prospects can be expected for models consistent with (1) but, at the same time, allowing a certain degree of non-saturation in the past epochs. In these so-called non-saturated HDE models [14, 16], the parameter c^2 is promoted to a function of cosmic time, $c^2(t)$. The function $c^2(t)$ should satisfy $c^2(t_0) \rightarrow 1$ (dark energy dominance), while $c^2(t) \ll 1$ during the radiation-dominated epoch. A promising setup, in which each

³ It is remarkable to note that even the absolute Bekenstein-Hawking bound can be saturated in the radiation-dominated epoch. Take for instance the popular Li's model [10] and solve for $\rho_{rad} \gg \rho_\Lambda$. One obtains, $\rho_\Lambda \simeq \rho_{rad0} a^{-3}$, where the subscript '0' denotes the present-day value. This determines, in turn, the IR cutoff as $L \sim M_{Pl}(\rho_{rad0})^{-1/2} a^{3/2}$. Equipped with these relationships, and $T \sim a^{-1}$, we find that the absolute bound $L^3 T^3 \lesssim L^2 M_{Pl}^2$, is saturated at $T \sim 10^9$ GeV. This gives an interesting limit on the post-inflation reheating temperature, i.e. the temperature at the beginning of the hot big bang universe. Since Li's model employs a saturated version of (1), when the absolute bound is saturated we have $R_s \gg L$, and therefore it is clear that this interesting bound cannot be fully trusted.

epoch represents a system not containing black holes would be

$$T^4 \sim c_{rad}^2(t) L^{-2} M_{Pl}^2, \quad (5)$$

$$\rho_\Lambda \sim c_\Lambda^2(t) L^{-2} M_{Pl}^2, \quad (6)$$

where the holographic bound is saturated asymptotically only by c_Λ^2 (in order to ensure the current dark energy dominance). On the other hand, $c_{rad}^2 \gg c_\Lambda^2$ (also $c_{rad}^2 \lesssim 1$) in the radiation-dominated era. The setup as given by Eqs. (5-6), with $c^2 s \lesssim 1$, is only a formal account of a system free of black holes. Note that with the choice (6) the UV/IR correspondence becomes more complicated, now depending on the particular choices for c_Λ^2 . The bottom line, however, is that, by UV/IR mixing, ρ_Λ should always (irrespective of the form of c_Λ^2) acquire the form given by Eq. (2) (footnote 1). The era of radiation-dominance therefore imposes a constraint, $T^4 > \rho_\Lambda$. On the other hand, in a conventional QFT with some infrared limitation, a system at a temperature T has an energy $L^3 T^4$ (and therefore energy density T^4), provided $L^{-1} < T < \Lambda$. If the mass scale is negligible with respect to the UV cutoff, $\rho_\Lambda \sim \Lambda^4$ (see footnote 1), the above constraints are impossible to satisfy simultaneously throughout the radiation-dominated era, showing thus internal inconsistency. With a more realistic estimate, $\rho_\Lambda \sim m\Lambda^3$ (see footnote 1), one obtains

$$\Lambda > T > m^{\frac{1}{4}} \Lambda^{\frac{3}{4}}. \quad (7)$$

Thus, when $m > \Lambda$, Eq. (7) would entail [via the case b) of Eq. (2)] $m < \Lambda$, showing internal inconsistency again. We have thus seen that though with some degree of non-saturation of the holographic bound, both systems (dark energy and radiation) can be made free of states lying within their Schwarzschild radius, a consistent description of takeover of the dominance by radiation within the same QFT is not possible.

Perhaps the situation is even worse than stated above. If an effective QFT is to encompass the standard models particles ($m \gtrsim 100$ GeV), the present-day UV cutoff is much smaller than $10^{-2.5}$ eV. Indeed, from $m\Lambda_0^3 \sim 10^{-11}$ eV⁴, one obtains $\Lambda_0 \sim 10^{-7}$ eV. This means that even in the present epoch (dominated by dark energy fluid) a consistent description of (CMBR) radiation is not viable since the present temperature of the universe $T_0 \sim 10^{-4}$ eV.

In conclusion, we have shown that an effective QFT, with a proposed relationship between UV and IR cutoffs as to eliminate the need for fine-tuning in the ‘old’ cosmological constant problem and explain furthermore dark energy at present, cannot describe consistently a

radiation-dominated universe. Such a framework is particularly compelling in description of an expanding universe since without a corresponding UV/IR mixing, conventional QFT may not be valid for arbitrarily large volumes. Albeit in a radiation-dominated epoch the UV/IR correspondence can be made virtually arbitrary, takeover by radiation cannot yet be obtained. Our results are quite generic in that they do not depend on the pressing problem of the choice of the IR cutoff. Because of the absence of a prominent energy scale (connected to microphysics), disparate mass scales as well as possibility that underlying framework may not be QFT (i.e. a black-hole fluid), we cannot *a priori* draw the same conclusion for a matter-dominated epoch. Still, on similar grounds as above it is seen that saturated HDE models would compromise a consistent description of that epoch as well. Our overall conclusion is therefore that the basic framework underlying all HDE models seems too *ad-hoc* to have any real explanatory value, which still keeps us in need of firmer theoretical background.

Acknowledgment. This work was supported by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport of the Republic of Croatia under contract No. 098-0982887-2872.

-
- [1] G. 't Hooft, gr-qc/9311026.
 - [2] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. (NY) 36 (1995) 6377.
 - [3] J. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 231.
 - [4] L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius, and J. Uglum, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 3742.
 - [5] S. Minwalla, M. Van Raamsdonk, and N. Seiberg, JHEP 0002 (2000) 020.
 - [6] T. Yoneya, Prog. Theor. Phys. 103 (2000) 1081.
 - [7] L. J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A10 (1995) 145.
 - [8] A. Cohen, D. Kaplan, and A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 4971.
 - [9] S. D. Hsu, Phys. Lett. B594 (2004) 1.
 - [10] M. Li, Phys. Lett. B603 (2004) 1.
 - [11] P. J. Steinhardt, in “Critical Problems in Physics”, edited by V. L. Fitch and Dr. R. Marlow (Princeton University Press), Princeton, N. J., (1997).
 - [12] M. Tegmark et.al., Phys. Rev. D69 (2004) 103501.
 - [13] R. Horvat, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 087301.

- [14] D. Pavón and W. Zimdahl, Phys. Lett. B628 (2005) 206.
- [15] For perfect fluids see, [10]; Q. G. Huang and M. Li, JCAP 0408 (2004) 013; for interacting fluids see e.g., B. Wang, Y. Gong and E. Abdalla, Phys. Lett. B624 (2005) 141; H. Kim, H. W. Lee and Y. S. Myung, Phys. Lett. B632 (2006) 605; H. M. Sadjadi and M. Honardoost, Phys. Lett. B647 (2007) 231; M. R. Setare, Phys. Lett. B642 (2006) 1; E. N. Saridakis, Phys. Lett. B660 (2008) 138.
- [16] B. Guberina, R. Horvat and H. Nikolić, JCAP 0701 (2007) 012; W. Zimdahl and D. Pavón, astro-ph/0606555.